



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 4450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,735	01/18/2002	Robert Sesek	10016958-1	3209

7590 12/21/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

PANNALA, SATHYANARAYA R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2164

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/052,735

Applicant(s)

SESEK ET AL.

Examiner

Sathyanarayan Pannala

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 6-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2 and 5 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 6-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Application's Amendment filed on 10/11/2005 has been entered with amended claims 1, 3-4, 10, 15, 22 and 28 and canceled claims 2 and 5. Claims 1, 3-4 and 6-30 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 22 is not limited to tangible embodiments. In view of Applicant's disclosure, specification on page 19, line 22 to page 20, line 6:

The computer-readable medium can be, for example but not limited to, an electronic, magnetic, optical, electromagnetic, infrared, or semiconductor system, apparatus, device, or propagation medium.

More specific examples of the computer-readable medium would include an electrical connection having one or more wires, a portable computer diskette, a RAM, a

Art Unit: 2164

ROM, an EPROM, an EEPROM, a flash memory, an optical fiber, and a portable CDROM.

Note that the computer-readable medium could even be paper or another suitable medium upon which the program is printed, as the program can be electronically captured, via, for instance, optical scanning of the paper or other medium, then compiled, interpreted or otherwise processed in a suitable manner if necessary, and then stored in a computer memory document-sending system 100.

It is not possible to consider a one computer-readable medium out of three categories listed as: storage medium such as RAM, ROM..., transmission medium such as electromagnetic, infrared, propagation medium... or medium such as paper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one

skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-6, 10-13, 15-16, 19-20, 22-23 and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker (US Patent 6,546,417) hereinafter Baker, and in view of Krueger et al. (US Patent 6,868,387) hereinafter Krueger.

8. As per independent claim 1, Baker teaches an electronic mail program includes an inbox list whereby different kinds of messages and attached documents are displayed with different kind of icons. Mail, which contains a file attachment, is listed in the box with an icon indicative of the type of file attached to the mail (col. 4, lines 63-65 and col. 5, lines 3-5). Baker teaches the claimed step of "determining whether a user sent a copy of a document, created by an application other than an email as an email attachment to a first set of at least one recipient via email" as the dual icon display indicates that the mail was created without any special authoring/reading component and has an attachment created by some other program (application) (Fig. 2a, col. 7, lines 36-39).

Baker does not explicitly teach automatically sending the revised document. However, Krueger teaches the claimed step of "if the user sent the copy of the document to the at least one recipient of the first set as an email attachment using an email application, correlating information with the document so that a copy of a revised version of the document can be sent automatically as another email attachment to the at least one recipient of the first set without the user accessing the email application" as editor 204 may be a simple text or compound document editor used to edit text or HTML documents or a computer aided design (CAD) drafting or graphics program employed to edit drawings or graphics program used to edit drawings in Tagged image file format (TIFF) and user to modify or revise part information 206 for a selected part. The process of automatically notifying outside suppliers of part revisions in accordance with a preferred embodiment. The notification agent utilizes the part number 212 to search

purchasing documents 210 contains the matching part number for the revised specification document to determine the email addresses 306 of the outside suppliers which should be notified of the part revision and the agent then generates an email notification of the part revision and transmits the notification 306 to each of the outside suppliers email addresses 306 (Fig. 2-3, col. 2, lines 49-55 and col. 4, line 53 to col. 5, line 2).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Krueger's teachings would have allowed Baker's method to send automated notification of revised document, in order to automate the process of notifying outside suppliers or others affected parties regarding relevant design (document) changes (col. 1, lines 42-45).

Baker teaches the claimed step of "correlating comprises encoding the document with the information" as the original internet email system as defined in 1982 with request for comments (RFC) 821 and 822 had a number of important limitations. Multipurpose internet mail extensions (MIME) standard for internet messages approved in 1992. MIME message header fields extend those defined in RFC 822 and describe the content and encoding type of the email message (col. 1 line 67 to col. 2, line 2).

Baker teaches the claimed step of "information comprises addresses of the at least one recipient of the first set" as the dual icon display indicates that the mail was created without any special authoring/reading component and has an attachment created by some other program (application) (Fig. 2a, col. 7, lines 36-39).

9. As per dependent claim 3, Baker teaches the claimed step of “the information comprises a location of the document in a device in which the document was created” as a TYPETABLE (10) data structure is created and maintained by the component TYPE_UPDATER (12). TYPETABLE is stored in hard disk. The five MIME types are listed in the Table 1 (examiner interprets that similarly the location the created document device, type of device can be created similar to TYPETABLE data) (Fig. 3, Table 1, col. 7, lines 56-62).

10. As per dependent claim 4, Baker teaches the claimed step of “the information comprises a location of the document in a device from which the document was sent” as shown in the Table 3, SG_ATTACH_TABLETYPE shows the location of the program file name (examiner interprets similarly the location of the document sent will be known) (Fig. 6b, col. 9, lines 39-45).

11. As per dependent claim 6, Baker and Krueger teaches the claim 1 as stated above and Krueger teaches the claimed step of “determining whether the user sent the copy of the document to at least one recipient of a second set and appending the information with addresses of the at least one recipient of the second set via email, if the user sent the copy of the document to the at least one recipient of the second set” as the agent 218 generates an email notification of the part (document) revision, including the link to the part specification document which was changed, and transmits to notification to each of the identified outside supplier email addresses (Fig. 3, col. 4,

line 65 to col. 5, line 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Krueger's teachings would have allowed Baker's method to send automated notification of revised document, in order to automate the process of notifying outside suppliers or others affected parties regarding relevant design (document) changes (col. 1, lines 42-45).

12. As per dependent claim 10, Krueger teaches the claimed step of "automatically enabling the at least one recipient of the first set to obtain the copy of the revised version of the document if the at least one recipient of the first set accesses the copy of the document such that, when the at least one recipient of the first set attempts to open the email attachment previously sent and corresponding to the copy of the document, the at least one recipient is automatically provided with access to the copy of the revised version document" as the process of automatically notifying outside suppliers of part revisions in accordance with a preferred embodiment. The notification agent utilizes the part number 212 to search purchasing documents 210 contains the matching part number for the revised specification document to determine the email addresses 306 of the outside suppliers which should be notified of the part revision and the agent then generates an email notification of the part revision and transmits the notification 306 to each of the outside suppliers email addresses 306 (Fig. 2-3, col. 2, lines 49-55 and col. 4, line 53 to col. 5, line 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to have

combined the teachings of the cited references because Krueger's teachings would have allowed Baker's method to send automated notification of revised document, in order to automate the process of notifying outside suppliers or others affected parties regarding relevant design (document) changes (col. 1, lines 42-45).

13. As per dependent claim 11, Krueger teaches the claimed step of "providing a graphical user interface enabling the user to choose an option to send the copy of the revised version of the document" as the graphical program edit drawings and to send as revised (Fig 2, col. 2, lines 52-53). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Krueger's teachings would have allowed Baker's method to send automated notification of revised document, in order to automate the process of notifying outside suppliers or others affected parties regarding relevant design (document) changes (col. 1, lines 42-45). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Krueger's teachings would have allowed Baker's method to send automated notification of revised document, in order to automate the process of notifying outside suppliers or others affected parties regarding relevant design (document) changes (col. 1, lines 42-45).

14. As per dependent claim 12, Baker teaches the claimed step of "selecting a threshold, the attainment of which enables the copy of the revised version of the

Art Unit: 2164

document to be obtained upon accessing the copy of the document” as the pruning the database is den periodically every day at 2.10 a.m. (col. 16, lines 11-15).

15. As per dependent claim 13, Baker teaches the claimed step of “the threshold is one of a date, a day, and a time” as the pruning the database is den periodically every day at 2.10 a.m. (col. 16, lines 11-15).

16. As per independent claim 15, Baker teaches an electronic mail program includes an inbox list whereby different kinds of messages and attached documents are displayed with different kind of icons. Mail, which contains a file attachment, is listed in the box with an icon indicative of the type of file attached to the mail (col. 4, lines 63-65 and col. 5, lines 3-5). Baker teaches the claimed step of “determine whether a user sent a copy of a document created by an application other than an email application and attached to an email message to a first set of at least one recipient via email” as the dual icon display indicates that the mail was created without any special authoring/reading component and has an attachment created by some other program (application) (Fig. 2a, col. 7, lines 36-39). Baker teaches the claimed “encode the document with information comprising an email address to which the document was sent via email” as the dual icon display indicates that the mail was created without any special authoring/reading component and has an attachment created by some other program (application) (Fig. 2a, col. 7, lines 36-39).

Baker does not explicitly teach automatically sending the revised document. However, Krueger teaches the claimed step of "a copy of a revised version of the document can be sent automatically as an attached to another email message without the user accessing the email application, if the user sent the copy of the document to the at least one recipient of the first set as an email attachment using an email application" as editor 204 may be a simple text or compound document editor used to edit text or HTML documents or a computer aided design (CAD) drafting or graphics program employed to edit drawings or graphics program used to edit drawings in Tagged image file format (TIFF) and user to modify or revise part information 206 for a selected part. The process of automatically notifying outside suppliers of part revisions in accordance with a preferred embodiment. The notification agent utilizes the part number 212 to search purchasing documents 210 contains the matching part number for the revised specification document to determine the email addresses 306 of the outside suppliers which should be notified of the part revision and the agent then generates an email notification of the part revision and transmits the notification 306 to each of the outside suppliers email addresses 306 (Fig. 2-3, col. 2, lines 49-55 and col. 4, line 53 to col. 5, line 2).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Krueger's teachings would have allowed Baker's method to send automated notification of revised document, in order to automate the process of

notifying outside suppliers or others affected parties regarding relevant design (document) changes (col. 1, lines 42-45).

17. As per dependent of claim 16, Krueger teaches the claimed “append the information with addresses of the at least one recipient of the second set, if the user sent the copy of the document to the at least one recipient of the second set and determine whether the user sent the copy of the document to at least one recipient of a second set” as the agent 218 generates an email notification of the part (document) revision, including the link to the part specification document which was changed, and transmits to notification to each of the identified outside supplier email addresses (Fig. 3, col. 4, line 65 to col. 5, line 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Krueger’s teachings would have allowed Baker’s method to send automated notification of revised document, in order to automate the process of notifying outside suppliers or others affected parties regarding relevant design (document) changes (col. 1, lines 42-45).

18. As per dependent claim 19, Krueger teaches the claimed step of “automatically enabling the at least one recipient of the first set to obtain the copy of the revised version of the document if the at least one recipient of the first set accesses the copy of the document” as the process of automatically notifying outside suppliers of part revisions in accordance with a preferred embodiment. The notification agent utilizes the

part number 212 to search purchasing documents 210 contains the matching part number for the revised specification document to determine the email addresses 306 of the outside suppliers which should be notified of the part revision and the agent then generates an email notification of the part revision and transmits the notification 306 to each of the outside suppliers email addresses 306 (Fig. 2-3, col. 2, lines 49-55 and col. 4, line 53 to col. 5, line 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Krueger's teachings would have allowed Baker's method to send automated notification of revised document, in order to automate the process of notifying outside suppliers or others affected parties regarding relevant design (document) changes (col. 1, lines 42-45).

19. As per dependent claim 20, Baker teaches the claimed step of "selecting a threshold, the attainment of which enables the copy of the revised version of the document to be obtained upon accessing the copy of the document" as the pruning the database is den periodically every day at 2.10 a.m. (col. 16, lines 11-15).

20. As per independent claim 22, As per independent claim 15, Baker teaches an electronic mail program includes an inbox list whereby different kinds of messages and attached documents are displayed with different kind of icons. Mail contains a file attachment is listed in the box with an icon indicative of the type of file attached to the mail (col. 4, lines 63-65 and col. 5, lines 3-5). Baker teaches the claimed step of "logic

Art Unit: 2164

configured to determine whether a user sent a copy of a document created by an application other than an email application and attached to an email message to a first set of at least one recipient via email” as the dual icon display indicates that the mail was created without any special authoring/reading component and has an attachment created by some other program (application) (Fig. 2a, col. 7, lines 36-39). Baker teaches the claimed step of “logic configured to correlate information with the document” as the dual icon display indicates that the mail was created without any special authoring/reading component and has an attachment created by some other program (application) (Fig. 2a, col. 7, lines 36-39).

Baker does not explicitly teach automatically sending the revised document. However, Krueger teaches the claimed step of “a copy of a revised version of the document can be sent automatically attached to another email message without the user accessing the email application, the logic correlates the information if the user sent the copy of the document to the at least one recipient of the first set as an email attachment using an email application” as editor 204 may be a simple text or compound document editor used to edit text or HTML documents or a computer aided design (CAD) drafting or graphics program employed to edit drawings or graphics program used to edit drawings in Tagged image file format (TIFF) and user to modify or revise part information 206 for a selected part. The process of automatically notifying outside suppliers of part revisions in accordance with a preferred embodiment. The notification agent utilizes the part number 212 to search purchasing documents 210 contains the matching part number for the revised specification document to determine the email

addresses 306 of the outside suppliers which should be notified of the part revision and the agent then generates an email notification of the part revision and transmits the notification 306 to each of the outside suppliers email addresses 306 (Fig. 2-3, col. 2, lines 49-55 and col. 4, line 53 to col. 5, line 2).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Krueger's teachings would have allowed Baker's method to send automated notification of revised document, in order to automate the process of notifying outside suppliers or others affected parties regarding relevant design (document) changes (col. 1, lines 42-45).

21. As per dependent claim 23, Krueger teaches the claimed "the logic configured to determine whether the user sent a copy of the document to at least one recipient of the second set and append the information with addresses of the at least one recipient of the second set, the logic appends if the user sent the copy of the document to the at least one recipient of the second set" as the agent 218 generates an email notification of the part (document) revision, including the link to the part specification document which was changed, and transmits to notification to each of the identified outside supplier email addresses (Fig. 3, col. 4, line 65 to col. 5, line 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Krueger's teachings would have allowed Baker's method to send automated notification of revised

Art Unit: 2164

document, in order to automate the process of notifying outside suppliers or others affected parties regarding relevant design (document) changes (col. 1, lines 42-45).

22. As per dependent claim 26, Krueger teaches the claimed step of “logic configured to automatically enable the at least one recipient of the first set to obtain the copy of the revised version of the document, the logic automatically enables if the at least one recipient of the first set accesses the copy of the document” as the process of automatically notifying outside suppliers of part revisions in accordance with a preferred embodiment. The notification agent utilizes the part number 212 to search purchasing documents 210 contains the matching part number for the revised specification document to determine the email addresses 306 of the outside suppliers which should be notified of the part revision and the agent then generates an email notification of the part revision and transmits the notification 306 to each of the outside suppliers email addresses 306 (Fig. 2-3, col. 2, lines 49-55 and col. 4, line 53 to col. 5, line 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Krueger’s teachings would have allowed Baker’s method to send automated notification of revised document, in order to automate the process of notifying outside suppliers or others affected parties regarding relevant design (document) changes (col. 1, lines 42-45).

Art Unit: 2164

23. As per dependent claim 27, Baker teaches the claimed step of “the application used to create the document is a word-processing application” as the mail message entitled “Minutes of Meeting” is listed with a MICROSOFT WORD icon indicating that the email message has a WORD file attached to it (Fig. 2, col. 6, line 66 to col. 7, line 2).

24. As per independent claim 28, Baker teaches an electronic mail program includes an inbox list whereby different kinds of messages and attached documents are displayed with different kind of icons. Mail, which contains a file attachment, is listed in the box with an icon indicative of the type of file attached to the mail (col. 4, lines 63-65 and col. 5, lines 3-5). Baker teaches the claimed step of “creating a file using an application other than an email application, attaching the file to an email message as a first email attachment and designating a first recipient to receive the email message with the first email attachment” as the dual icon display indicates that the mail was created without any special authoring/reading component and has an attachment created by some other program (application) (Fig. 2a, col. 7, lines 36-39). Baker teaches the claimed step of “encoding the file with information to an email address to which the email message was sent via email” (Fig. 2a, col. 1 line 67 to col. 2, line 2 and col. 7, lines 36-39)

Baker does not explicitly teach automatically sending the revised document. However, Krueger teaches the claimed step of “a revised version of the file is automatically sent to the first recipient, at the email address encoded with the file, as a

second email attachment via a subsequent email in response to the file being revised using the application” as editor 204 may be a simple text or compound document editor used to edit text or HTML documents or a computer aided design (CAD) drafting or graphics program employed to edit drawings or graphics program used to edit drawings in Tagged image file format (TIFF) and user to modify or revise part information 206 for a selected part. The process of automatically notifying outside suppliers of part revisions in accordance with a preferred embodiment. The notification agent utilizes the part number 212 to search purchasing documents 210 contains the matching part number for the revised specification document to determine the email addresses 306 of the outside suppliers which should be notified of the part revision and the agent then generates an email notification of the part revision and transmits the notification 306 to each of the outside suppliers email addresses 306 (Fig. 2-3, col. 2, lines 49-55 and col. 4, line 53 to col. 5, line 2).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Krueger’s teachings would have allowed Baker’s method to send automated notification of revised document, in order to automate the process of notifying outside suppliers or others affected parties regarding relevant design (document) changes (col. 1, lines 42-45).

25. As per dependent claim 29, Krueger teaches the claimed step of “the subsequent email is sent automatically in response to the revised version of the file being saved to

Art Unit: 2164

memory of a data storage device under direction of the application used to create the file” as Agent 218 transmits notifications to outside suppliers whenever a part revision is created, modified, deleted, or released within part information documents 206. The part revision is initiated and saved by an engineer or designer, outside suppliers are notified to allow the supplier as much lead time as possible in preparing to retool production (Fig. 2, col. 4, lines 29-35). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Krueger’s teachings would have allowed Baker’s method to send automated notification of revised document, in order to automate the process of notifying outside suppliers or others affected parties regarding relevant design (document) changes (col. 1, lines 42-45).

26. As per dependent claim 30, Krueger teaches the claimed step of “in response to the first recipient attempting to access the first email attachment, access to the revised version of the file is automatically provided to the first recipient” as agent 218 generates an email message regarding the revision, including a URL link to the revised document which allows the outside supplier receiving an email message to access and review the revised document (examiner assumes that the revised document URL will be the same as the original document, to access the revised document) (Fig. 2, col. 4, lines 22-26). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Krueger’s teachings would have allowed Baker’s method to send automated

Art Unit: 2164

notification of revised document, in order to automate the process of notifying outside suppliers or others affected parties regarding relevant design (document) changes (col. 1, lines 42-45).

27. Claims 7-9, 17-18 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker (US Patent 6,546,417) hereinafter Baker, in view of Krueger et al. (US Patent 6,868,387) hereinafter Krueger, and in view of Naylor et al. (US Patent 6,625,642) hereinafter Naylor.

28. As per dependent claim 7, Krueger teaches the claimed step of “determining whether the at least one recipient of the second set sent the copy of the document to at least one recipient of a third set and appending the information with addresses of the at least one recipient of the third set, if the at least one recipient of the second set sent the copy of the document to the at least one recipient of the third set” as the notification agent utilizes the part number 212 to search purchasing documents 210 contains the matching part number for the revised specification document to determine the email addresses 306 of the outside suppliers which should be notified of the part revision and the agent then generates an email notification of the part revision and transmits the notification 306 to each of the outside suppliers email addresses 306 (Fig. 3, col. 4, line 53 to col. 5, line 2). Baker and Krueger do not explicitly teach forwarding the received email to additional recipients. However, Naylor teaches forwarding the received email to third set of recipients, as the forwarding the emails to appropriate

recipients (Fig. 3, col. 9, lines 57-62). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of the cited references because the process of transmitting email by Naylor would have provided Baker's with necessary method, which would allow the sender to send the messages to all recipients at one time. Further, by combining Naylor's method would have allowed Baker's method to send emails to one or several recipients (col. 2, lines 4-6).

29. As per dependent claim 8, Krueger teaches the claimed step of "the copy of the revised version of the document to be sent to the at least one recipient of the first, second, and third sets when the revised version of the document is saved in memory of a storage device using the application that created the revised version" as the notification agent utilizes the part number 212 to search purchasing documents 210 contains the matching part number for the revised specification document to determine the email addresses 306 of the outside suppliers which should be notified of the part revision and the agent then generates an email notification of the part revision and transmits the notification 306 to each of the outside suppliers email addresses 306 (Fig. 3, col. 4, line 53 to col. 5, line 2). Baker and Krueger do not explicitly teach forwarding the received email to additional recipients. However, Naylor teaches forwarding the received email to third set of recipients, as the forwarding the emails to appropriate recipients (Fig. 3, col. 9, lines 57-62). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention to incorporate

Art Unit: 2164

the teachings of the cited references because the process of transmitting email by Naylor would have provided Baker's with necessary method, which would allow the sender to send the messages to all recipients at one time. Further, by combining Naylor's method would have allowed Baker's method to send emails to one or several recipients (col. 2, lines 4-6).

30. As per dependent claim 9, Krueger teaches the claimed step of "providing a graphical user interface enabling the user to choose an option to send the copy of the revised version of the document" as the graphical program edit drawings and to send as revised (Fig 2, col. 2, lines 52-53). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Krueger's teachings would have allowed Baker's method to send automated notification of revised document, in order to automate the process of notifying outside suppliers or others affected parties regarding relevant design (document) changes (col. 1, lines 42-45).

31. As per dependent of claim 17, Krueger teaches the claimed "determine whether the at least one recipient of the second set sent the copy of the document to at least one recipient of a third set and append the information with addresses of the at least one recipient of the third set, if the at least one recipient of the second set sent the copy of the document to the at least one recipient of the third set" as the notification agent utilizes the part number 212 to search purchasing documents 210 contains the

matching part number for the revised specification document to determine the email addresses 306 of the outside suppliers which should be notified of the part revision and the agent then generates an email notification of the part revision and transmits the notification 306 to each of the outside suppliers email addresses 306 (Fig. 3, col. 4, line 53 to col. 5, line 2).

Baker and Krueger do not explicitly teach forwarding the received email to additional recipients. However, Naylor teaches forwarding the received email to third set of recipients, as the forwarding the emails to appropriate recipients (Fig. 3, col. 9, lines 57-62). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of the cited references because the process of transmitting email by Naylor would have provided Baker's with necessary method, which would allow the sender to send the messages to all recipients at one time. Further, by combining Naylor's method would have allowed Baker's method to send emails to one or several recipients (col. 2, lines 4-6).

32. As per dependent of claim 18, Krueger teaches the claimed "the copy of the revised version of the document to be sent to the at least one recipient of the first set when the revised version of the document is saved" as the notification agent utilizes the part number 212 to search purchasing documents 210 contains the matching part number for the revised specification document to determine the email addresses 306 of the outside suppliers which should be notified of the part revision and the agent then generates an email notification of the part revision and transmits the notification 306 to

each of the outside suppliers email addresses 306 (Fig. 3, col. 4, line 53 to col. 5, line 2). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Krueger's teachings would have allowed Baker's method to send automated notification of revised document, in order to automate the process of notifying outside suppliers or others affected parties regarding relevant design (document) changes (col. 1, lines 42-45).

Baker and Krueger do not explicitly teach forwarding the received email to additional recipients. However, Naylor teaches forwarding the received email to third set of recipients, as the forwarding the emails to appropriate recipients (Fig. 3, col. 9, lines 57-62). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of the cited references because the process of transmitting email by Naylor would have provided Baker's with necessary method, which would allow the sender to send the messages to all recipients at one time. Further, by combining Naylor's method would have allowed Baker's method to send emails to one or several recipients (col. 2, lines 4-6).

33. As per dependent claim 24, Krueger teaches the claimed "logic configured to determine whether the at least one recipient of the second set sent the copy of the document to at least one recipient of a third set and append the information with addresses of the at least one recipient of the third set, the logic appends if the user sent the copy of the document to the at least one recipient of the second set sent the copy of

the document to the at least one recipient of the third set” as the notification agent utilizes the part number 212 to search purchasing documents 210 contains the matching part number for the revised specification document to determine the email addresses 306 of the outside suppliers which should be notified of the part revision and the agent then generates an email notification of the part revision and transmits the notification 306 to each of the outside suppliers email addresses 306 (Fig. 3, col. 4, line 53 to col. 5, line 2).

Baker and Krueger do not explicitly teach forwarding the received email to additional recipients. However, Naylor teaches forwarding the received email to third set of recipients, as the forwarding the emails to appropriate recipients (Fig. 3, col. 9, lines 57-62). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of the cited references because the process of transmitting email by Naylor would have provided Baker's with necessary method, which would allow the sender to send the messages to all recipients at one time. Further, by combining Naylor's method would have allowed Baker's method to send emails to one or several recipients (col. 2, lines 4-6).

34. As per dependent claim 25, Krueger teaches the claimed “logic configured to automatically enable the copy of the revised version of the document to be sent to the at least one recipient of the first set, the logic automatically enables when the revised version of the document is saved” as the notification agent utilizes the part number 212 to search purchasing documents 210 contains the matching part number for the revised

specification document to determine the email addresses 306 of the outside suppliers which should be notified of the part revision and the agent then generates an email notification of the part revision and transmits the notification 306 to each of the outside suppliers email addresses 306 (Fig. 3, col. 4, line 53 to col. 5, line 2). Baker and Krueger do not explicitly teach forwarding the received email to additional recipients. However, Naylor teaches forwarding the received email to third set of recipients, as the forwarding the emails to appropriate recipients (Fig. 3, col. 9, lines 57-62). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of the cited references because the process of transmitting email by Naylor would have provided Baker's with necessary method, which would allow the sender to send the messages to all recipients at one time. Further, by combining Naylor's method would have allowed Baker's method to send emails to one or several recipients (col. 2, lines 4-6).

35. Claims 14 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker (US Patent 6,546,417) hereinafter Baker, in view of Krueger et al. (US Patent 6,868,387) hereinafter Krueger, and in view of Nielsen (US Patent 5,870,548) hereinafter Nielsen.

36. As per dependent claim 14, Nielsen teaches the claimed step of "providing a graphical user interface that allows the user to change the information so that the at least one recipient of the first set receives the copy of the revised version of the

Art Unit: 2164

document every time the at least one recipient accesses the copy of the document” as the selectable control area “Modify This Message” 677 activates the process of allowing the user to edit the message (Fig. 6D, col. 9, lines 12-22). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Nielsen’s teachings would have allowed Baker’s method to use Graphical user interface are provided to evoking the commands or computer operations (col. 5, lines 21-24).

37. As per dependent claim 21, Nielsen teaches the claimed step of “provides a graphical user interface that allows the user to change the information so that the at least one recipient of the first set receives the copy of the revised version of the document every time the at least one recipient accesses the copy of the document” as the selectable control area “Modify This Message” 677 activates the process of allowing the user to edit the message (Fig. 6D, col. 9, lines 12-22). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Nielsen’s teachings would have allowed Baker’s method to use Graphical user interface are provided to evoking the commands or computer operations (col. 5, lines 21-24).

Response to Arguments

38. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/11/2005 with respect to claims 1, 3-4 and 6-30 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and details as follows:

a) Applicant's argument stated as "Applicants respectfully assert that the references are legally deficient for the purpose of rendering claim 1 unpatentable."

In response to the Applicants argument, Examiner disagrees, because the applicant, merely combining claims 2 and 5 with claim 1 will not over come the prior art. Baker also teaches claim 2 and 5 as stated in the recent Office Action. The rejection of claim 1 holds good even after amending the claim.

b) The same reason applies to other amended claims 15, 22 and 28 because the amendment claims is similar to the claim 1 amendment.

Conclusion

39. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2164


the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sathyanarayan Pannala whose telephone number is (571) 272-4115. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Sathyanarayan Pannala
Examiner
Art Unit 2164

srp
December 16, 2005


MOHAMMAD ALI
PRIMARY EXAMINER